

REGULAR WEEKLY SESSION-----ROANOKE CITY COUNCIL

February 3, 2003

9:00 a.m.

The Council of the City of Roanoke met in regular session on Monday, February 3, 2003, at 9:00 a.m., the regular meeting hour, in the City Council Chamber, fourth floor, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke, Virginia, with Mayor Ralph K. Smith presiding, pursuant to Chapter 2, Administration, Article II, City Council, Section 2-15, Rules of Procedure, Rule 1, Regular Meetings, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended; and pursuant to Resolution No. 36193-010603 adopted on January 6, 2003, which changed the time of commencement of the regular meeting of Council to be held on the first Monday in each month from 12:15 p.m., to 9:00 a.m.

PRESENT: Council Members William D. Bestpitch, M. Rupert Cutler, Alfred T. Dowe, Jr., and Mayor Ralph K. Smith-----4.

ABSENT: Council Members William H. Carder, C. Nelson Harris and Linda F. Wyatt-----3.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; Jesse A. Hall, Director of Finance; and Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.

At 9:05 a.m., the Mayor declared the meeting in recess.

At 9:15 a.m., the meeting reconvened in the Emergency Operations Center Conference Room, Room 159, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke, Virginia, with Mayor Smith presiding, and all Members of the Council in attendance, with the exception of Council Member Carder.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; Jesse A. Hall, Director of Finance; and Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.

COUNCIL:

ITEMS LISTED ON THE 2:00 P.M. COUNCIL DOCKET REQUIRING QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION/CLARIFICATION/ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS: Council Member Cutler referred to agenda item 4.a., in connection with the rezoning of land by the Northwest Neighborhood Environmental Organization and Robert Crowder in the 500 block of Loudon and Centre Avenues, N. W., and the impact of such rezoning on the business of Quality Produce Company. He stated that the proposed ordinance does not reflect the concerns expressed by Quality Produce Company at the Council meeting on Tuesday, January 21, 2003, that the business will not be harmed by construction of the proposed new housing complex across the street from its operation.

The City Attorney advised that it is not known how Quality Produce Company will operate in the future; the attorney for Quality Produce has requested that the City take the position that his client is a good corporate citizen; however, the City Attorney advised that the City should issue no more than a general statement relating to the business inasmuch as Council is not authorized to give away police powers of the City.

The City Manager advised that at the 2:00 p.m., Council session, it would be appropriate for a member of Council to advise that the matter was discussed during the Council's 9:00 a.m. work session, that Council is concerned about the potential adverse impact on the business of Quality Produce Company, but the Council is not in a position to issue a letter that would have the affect of assuring Quality Produce that it will not be interfered with in the future. She called attention to plans of NNEO for additional landscaping that would act to some extent as a sound barrier, however, the current budget of NNEO may not contain funds to accommodate additional landscaping at this time.

Council Member Wyatt offered a suggestion that there be full disclosure to all occupants prior to moving into the NNEO housing units that there could be noise in the early morning hours as a result of the operation of Quality Produce Company; whereupon, the Director of Planning and Code Enforcement advised that he would confer with the City Attorney and the Executive Director of NNEO prior to the 2:00 p.m. Council meeting to determine if they would be amenable to the suggestion.

With regard to Council agenda item 6.a.7, which is a communication from the City Manager in connection with the Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit Registration Statement for Storm Water Discharges, Mr. Cutler inquired if the City's Environmental Protection Administrator would be present for the 2:00 p.m. Council session to be commended on his work; whereupon, the City Manager advised that Mr. Truntich was out of the City, but would be advised of the Council's remarks.

With regard to Council agenda item 6.a.6, which is a communication from the City Manager recommending transfer of funds for traffic calming initiatives, Council Member Wyatt expressed concern with regard to transferring the funds from the Valley View Boulevard Exchange budget. She requested more information on how the funds will be allocated, and advised that Williamson Road residents have been patient in regard to traffic needs in the Valley View area and have waited patiently for Phase II of the Valley View project, however, it now appears that the remaining funds are proposed to be transferred to another account. She inquired about the potential impact to the Valley View Interchange project if the funds are used for another purpose and requested more specific information on the City Manger's proposed traffic calming initiatives before voting to allocate the recommended funds.

The Director of Public Works advised that the Valley View Interchange project is closed out, with no further charges anticipated to be accrued. He stated that Phase II of the Valley View project is 10-15 years in the future on the list of Virginia Department of Transportation projects for future implementation.

The City Manager advised that traffic calming expenditures will be used for Memorial Avenue, Grandin Road, Williamson Road, and the Bullitt/Jamison Corridor which are the latest "hot button" topics discussed by the City for traffic calming. She further advised that City staff has brought each of the above mentioned traffic calming projects to Council for briefings; however, if the majority of the Council is not ready for staff to proceed on the specific projects, staff should be advised accordingly. She stated that the item can be withdrawn from the Council agenda to allow for specific work sessions on each traffic calming project, which can be followed by a vote of the Council.

It was stated that it would be helpful for Council to know the priority of traffic calming areas to be addressed by the City and costs pertaining to each project. It was also stated that if the other loop of the Valley View Boulevard Interchange is not to be completed for another 10 - 15 years, the City should put the funds to use now, and the City should work with VDOT to provide more aesthetically pleasing signage when leaving Valley View Mall.

BRIEFINGS BY CITY STAFF:

CHURCH AVENUE PARKING STUDY:

The City Manager advised that studies have been completed in the past of various aspects of the community, some of which have been adopted and others have been used as tools by City staff, but were not officially presented to the Council. She called attention to a study of the western section of the downtown area, or the Jefferson Center area, that suggested over the long term that there would be a need for some type of parking facility. She explained that as the City reviewed the construction/design of Phase II of the Police Building on Campbell Avenue, the issue of parking for the facility, as well as certain other locations in the area was discussed, including the soon to be ground breaking for the new YMCA, increased usage at the Jefferson Center as a venue for numerous activities, and reuse of the Cotton Mill Building. She stated that at her request, City staff commissioned a parking study that would take into account all of the needs, along with parking for the courthouse and other buildings along Church Avenue; the study has been completed and while City staff does not have a specific conclusion to recommend to the Council as to location, size and cost, it was considered to be advantageous to share the information with Council prior to consideration of the Capital Improvements Program budget and departmental budgets over the next several months.

The City Engineer presented a map of the study area which spans from Second Street on the east, to 7th Street on the west, and Campbell Avenue on the north down to Marshall Avenue. He advised that four sites were identified by the consultant, the purpose of which was to include both active and planning projects in the Church Avenue west corridor, encompassing Phase II expansion of the Police Building, the new YMCA Aquatic Center, potential renovations and expansion of the courthouse building, and the Jefferson Center, etc. He explained that a detailed inventory of every parking supply in the area was provided by time of day, all stakeholders were identified, including the Jefferson Center, YMCA, Red Cross, Oakley's Funeral Home, municipal activities, courts and jail activities, and proposed

use of the Cotton Mill. He advised that the consultant collected all of the pertinent data and built parking supply and demand curves to look at parking demand for each stakeholder based on time of day and weekend activity.

He explained that the study concluded that for a typical weekday, there is a deficit of approximately 454 parking spaces in the study area, based on a peak demand for about 930 spaces; peak period generally occurs between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m., and there are currently about 533 spaces in the study area which leaves a deficit of about 450 spaces. He advised that the study identified a potential shortfall for Saturday afternoon/evening performances at the Jefferson Center, which calls for a peak demand of 560 spaces, with only 286 currently available parking spaces. In addressing the parking deficit, he advised that structured parking of some kind is likely, at a cost in the range of \$10,000.00 per space up to about \$15,000.00 not including land costs, engineering, etc., for a 500 space parking garage in the price range of \$5 - \$7.5 million in construction costs; and called attention to potential partners, some of which include the YMCA and the Jefferson Center. He advised that the consultant identified the following sites: Luck Avenue site which is the surface lot owned by the City, the site of the existing YMCA building which is a parcel of land that will be owned by the City when the new YMCA building is completed, and the site directly behind the police building on Church Avenue which is privately held; and other potential sites located on Campbell Avenue and owned by The Roanoke Times, and the Salem Avenue property that was destroyed by fire. He explained that from the perspective of City staff, there is a demand for 500 parking spaces to be located somewhere in the proximity of the study area; City staff is looking at the pluses and minuses of each of the potential sites; and staff will prepare a Capital Improvements Program project for Council's consideration as a part of the budget process.

During a discussion by Council, the following points were made: City staff should be cognizant of the need to design a facility that will fit in with the character of the area; First Baptist Church should be approached as a potential stakeholder; and Roanoke is not a walking community, so there could be a need for two smaller facilities, as opposed to one large parking facility to address the parking issue at the Jefferson Center/YMCA and other locations closer to downtown Roanoke.

The City Manager advised that in establishing the location, no one site will satisfy the needs of all stakeholders; however, her commitment to staff has been, and is in concert with the City's Comprehensive Plan, that the City does not wish to build any more surface parking lots, but prefers to build structures on parking lots. Additionally, she stated that government should build on the more challenging locations and leave the prime spots for future development by the private sector.

It was suggested that as City staff studies the parking garage issue, it should also explore the feasibility of a shuttle bus system, making it more cost effective to construct a larger parking garage, as opposed to two smaller parking garages.

The City Manager advised that City staff will review methods of financing and a recommendation will be forwarded to Council at a later date.

FIRST STREET BRIDGE:

The City Manager advised that some time ago, a status report was presented to the Council regarding renovation/rehabilitation of the First Street Bridge as a pedestrian bridge and, at that time, the direction from Council was to delay any additional work on the bridge until the Outlook Roanoke Plan was updated; City staff was instructed to cease any further design, and in the meantime construction of the Gainsboro Bridge proceeded. She further advised that the Outlook Roanoke Plan brought forth the recommendation that the bridge should also be vehicular; and when consultants reviewed the bridge configuration, it was determined that there would be sufficient space for only one-way vehicular traffic and it was suggested that traffic should be directed into the downtown area. She stated that with adoption of the Outlook Roanoke Plan by the City Planning Commission and City Council, additional design work was completed and the purpose of the briefing was to present Council with the latest design sketches for rehabilitation of the First Street Bridge. She indicated that this particular design is in concert with adoption of the Outlook Roanoke Plan for a vehicular bridge, with one way traffic into the City and a pedestrian walkway, and it will be necessary to request additional funding by Council.

Ms. Wyatt advised that previously when considering the Outlook Roanoke Plan, she was assured that adoption of the Plan did not mean that the First Street Bridge would automatically be a vehicular bridge. The City Manager responded that staff has completed the work and is prepared to brief Council on both cost and design issues, however, there are funding issues which require additional direction from the Council as soon as possible. She called attention to the need to move forward with improvements to the First Street Bridge, because in its current condition, the bridge represents unfinished business and provides a sense of uncertainty about the City's plans.

The City Engineer advised that the existing bridge is in poor condition, was previously closed because of its condition, and has been closed for over two years. He presented information on the current concept which features a new bridge that very closely resembles the old bridge that would be designed to carry vehicles and pedestrians in one direction from north to south. He further advised that the

concept provides that existing stone piers will be used on either side with moderate rehabilitation work, a new steel truss structure will be constructed that will appear exactly the same as the existing truss bridge, with a concrete deck supported by four steel girders underneath, the pedestrian walkway would be on the same side as it currently exists and varies in width from about seven feet narrowing down to 5.5 feet in one spot, a one vehicle lane up to 12 feet wide, a concrete walkway at Salem Avenue, the existing ramp would be replaced and support piers would be changed, a new descending ramp will be constructed, and a pedestrian walkway will be constructed on the east side of the bridge, with one way vehicular traffic to the west.

The City Engineer explained that the remainder of the features, in concept, include landscaping design with period lighting fixtures similar to those in the Historic Gainsboro neighborhood, sidewalk improvements from the north end of the bridge, and a handicap ramp that would be used to accommodate the parking garage. He stated that project cost is estimated at \$2.2 million, and approximately \$700,000.00 is currently identified for the First Street Bridge, therefore, there is a budget issue to be addressed.

Mr. Cutler advised that Explore Park would be interested in the First Street Bridge in the event it is to be recycled.

The City Manager advised that the \$2.2 million includes \$275,000.00 for removal of railroad signals and Norfolk Southern has been requested to consider that as their cost, however, no response has been received to date. She further advised that a pedestrian bridge with an elevator on the south side would cost approximately \$1.1 million.

Vice-Mayor Harris advised that when the elevator was designed, the Council at that time operated on the premise that the First Street Bridge would be a pedestrian bridge; there is a substantial cost differential between pedestrian only and pedestrian/vehicular of approximately \$1 million; the goal has been to create pedestrian activity with the Henry Street Project, the Higher Education Center, and the railside linear walk, therefore, the First Street Bridge creates the necessary link between these pedestrian-oriented concepts; and the City has made a significant investment to make the Second Street Bridge vehicular. He stated that he did not see a great need to make the First Street Bridge a one-way vehicular bridge because once the bridge is crossed in the direction of the Higher Education Center, one of the other vehicular arteries will have to be used to exit the area. He indicated that all things taken into consideration, the original concept is still the best concept -- a pedestrian only bridge, and he encouraged Council to make a decision as soon as possible so that the City can move forward on design of the First Street Bridge.

In view of the costs involved, Council Member Bestpitch advised that it would be short sighted on the part of the City not to make the bridge one way vehicular/pedestrian. He stated that the more opportunities that are provided for persons to access The Hotel Roanoke, the Dumas Artistic Center, RNDC development, etc., the more they will want to come back to the area for future events. He advised that while there is some additional cost involved, it represents a reasonable amount of additional money when compared to the amount of traffic that will use the bridge.

Council Member Cutler advised that regardless of whether the First Street Bridge is vehicular or not, one of the potential uses is that it be a part of the Lick Run Greenway, and the Roanoke Valley Greenway Commission acknowledges telephone calls regularly from persons attending meetings at The Hotel Roanoke who inquire about 3k or 5k jogging paths from The Hotel Roanoke to various destinations. He stated that he is in favor of encouraging pedestrian use of the bridge, with or without vehicular traffic.

Council Member Wyatt spoke to the concept of providing a picnic shelter for use by school children visiting the area which could be constructed in the vicinity of the First Street Bridge. She stated that if the bridge is pedestrian, more persons will have the opportunity to visit those venues in the area that Roanoke wishes to showcase.

There was discussion in regard to the cost of constructing a pedestrian bridge with no elevator.

Council Member Dowe suggested that the City of Roanoke propose that the First Street Bridge be named the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial Bridge. He called attention to discussions with various organizations in the community and advised that there does appear to be a consensus within the City regarding the possibility of naming of the First Street Bridge in memory of Dr. King, with the understanding that the First Street Bridge may, or may not, be the first or the last thing that will be named in memory of Dr. King.

Ms. Wyatt advised that as a pedestrian bridge, the First Street Bridge could serve as a history walk to highlight the life of Dr. King and his role in the Civil Rights movement, it could serve as a teaching tool for the community in general, and it could serve as a symbol to bridge the community, which is what Dr. King's life was about.

Mr. Cutler concurred in the remarks of Mr. Dowe and inquired as to the feasibility of providing a shuttle bus to cross the bridge, eliminating the need for vehicular traffic.

There was discussion in regard to public input on the proposal to name the bridge in memory of Dr. King; whereupon, it was noted that the proposal of Mr. Dowe meets the criteria of the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Committee that was appointed by the City Manager to study and submit recommendations for a fitting memorial to Dr. King.

Vice-Mayor Harris moved that Council vote on the question of whether the First Street Bridge will be vehicular/pedestrian at its meeting on Tuesday, February 18, 2003, at 2:00 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dowe and adopted.

There was discussion as to whether a public hearing is in order in connection with naming the First Street Bridge in memory of Dr. King; whereupon, the Mayor advised that at this point it would be appropriate for the community to engage in discussions.

It was the consensus of Council that the remainder of the briefings would take place following the 2:00 p.m. session of the Council.

At 12:00 noon, the Mayor declared the meeting in recess.

At 2:00 p.m., on Monday, February 3, 2003, the Council meeting reconvened in the City Council Chamber, fourth floor, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke, Virginia, with Mayor Smith presiding.

PRESENT: Council Members William D. Bestpitch, M. Rupert Cutler, Alfred T. Dowe, Jr., C. Nelson Harris, Linda F. Wyatt and Mayor Ralph K. Smith-----6.

ABSENT: Council Member William H. Carder-----1.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; Jesse A. Hall, Director of Finance; and Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.

The meeting was opened with a prayer by The Reverend Robert L. Beasley, Chief Pastor, St. John's Episcopal Church.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America was led by Mayor Smith.

PRESENTATIONS AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

PROCLAMATIONS - SCHOOLS: The Mayor presented a proclamation declaring February 9 - 15, 2003, as Career and Technical Education Week.

CONSENT AGENDA

The Mayor advised that all matters listed under the Consent Agenda were considered to be routine by the Members of Council and would be enacted by one motion in the form, or forms, listed on the Consent Agenda, and if discussion was desired, that item would be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered separately. He called attention to two requests for Closed Session.

MINUTES: Minutes of the regular meeting of Council held on Monday, December 16, 2002, and recessed until Wednesday, December 18, 2002, were before the body.

(For full text , see Minutes on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

Mr. Dowe moved that the reading of the minutes be dispensed with and that the Minutes be approved as recorded. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cutler and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Dowe, Harris, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler and Mayor Smith -----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Carder was absent.)

COMMITTEES-CITY COUNCIL: A communication from Mayor Ralph K. Smith requesting that Council convene in a Closed Meeting to discuss a special award, being the Shining Star Award, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711 (A)(10), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, was before the body.

Mr. Dowe moved that Council concur in the request of the Mayor to convene in Closed Session as above described. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cutler and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Dowe, Harris, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler and Mayor Smith -----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Carder was absent.)

CITY ATTORNEY-CITY COUNCIL: A communication from the City Attorney requesting that Council convene in a Closed Meeting to consult with legal counsel on a matter of pending litigation, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711 (A)(7), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, was before the body.

Mr. Dowe moved that Council concur in the request of the City Attorney to convene in Closed Session as above described. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cutler and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Dowe, Harris, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler and Mayor Smith -----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Carder was absent.)

SIGNS/BILLBOARDS/AWNINGS-LICENSES: A communication from the City Manager advising that pursuant to requirements of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, the City of Roanoke is required to hold a public hearing on proposed encroachments into public right-of-way; whereupon, she requested that Council schedule a public hearing for Tuesday, February 18, 2003, at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in connection with a request for encroachment into public right-of-way for installation of an awning at 1 West Campbell Avenue, was before the body.

Mr. Dowe moved that Council concur in the request of the City Manager. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cutler and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Dowe, Harris, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler and Mayor Smith -----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Carder was absent.)

OATHS OF OFFICE-COMMITTEES-INDUSTRIES: A communication from Lynn D. Avis, Chair, Industrial Development Authority of the City of Roanoke, advising of the resignation of Stark H. Jones as a Director of the Industrial Development Authority, was before Council.

Mr. Dowe moved that the communication be received and filed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cutler and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Dowe, Harris, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Carder was absent.)

OATHS OF OFFICE-COMMITTEES-ROANOKE ARTS COMMISSION - ROANOKE NEIGHBORHOOD PARTNERSHIP: The following reports of qualification were before Council :

Nelett H. Lor as a member of the Roanoke Arts Commission, for a term ending June 30, 2005; and

Robin Murphy-Kelso as a member of the Roanoke Neighborhood Partnership Steering Committee, for a term ending November 30, 2005.

Mr. Dowe moved that the reports of qualification be received and filed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cutler and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Dowe, Harris, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler and Mayor Smith -----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Carder was absent.)

REGULAR AGENDA

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

ZONING-INDUSTRIES: Council at its regular meeting on Tuesday, January 21, 2003, having continued a public hearing on the request of the Northwest Neighborhood Environmental Organization and Robert Crowder to rezone nine tracts of land located on the south side of the 500 block of Loudon Avenue, N. W., identified as Official Tax Nos. 2013101-2013109, inclusive, from RM-2, Residential Multi-family, Medium Density District, to RM-3, Residential Multi-family, High Density District, subject to certain conditions; and three tracts of land located on the north side of the 500 block of Centre Avenue, N. W., identified as Official Tax Nos. 2013117-2013119, inclusive, from LM Light Manufacturing District, to RM-3, Residential Multi-family, High Density District, subject to certain conditions, the matter was again before the body.

On Tuesday, January 21, 2003, concerns were raised by Quality Produce Company that its business might be impacted by the proposed apartments; whereupon, Shusheela Shende, spoke on behalf of the Northwest Neighborhood Development Corporation and advised that NNEO representatives have met with representatives of Quality Produce Company and NNEO proffers the following: (1) NNEO and Robert Crowder will work with Quality Produce Company to install landscaping at no cost to Quality Produce that will function as a sound buffer; (2) all buildings to be located on the north side of the 500 block of Centre Avenue, N. W., and will have all bedrooms located toward the rear of the buildings; (3) it is recognized that the warehouse operation of Quality Produce Company, 116 Centre Avenue, N. W., generates normal truck traffic and noise from daily operation of its business; (4) and the petitioners agree to inform any potential residents of the existence and operation of Quality Produce Company as a business at that location.

Mr. Harris requested that the above described additional proffers become an official attachment to the request for rezoning.

Mr. Harris offered the following ordinance, including the four above described proffers:

(#36225-020303) AN ORDINANCE to amend §36.1-3, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended, and Sheet No. 201, Sectional 1976 Zone Map, City of Roanoke, to rezone certain property within the City, subject to certain conditions proffered by the applicant; and dispensing with the second reading of this ordinance by title.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 67, page 106.)

Mr. Harris moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 36225-020303. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dowe.

Michael Pace, Attorney, representing Quality Produce Company, advised that NNEO has worked with Quality Produce during the past week to develop the additional proffers which are in keeping with the request of his client and are satisfactory to Quality Produce Company. He additionally requested some assurance from the City of Roanoke that there will be no restrictions placed on the property of Quality Produce Company as a result of the proposed development by NNEO.

Council Member Bestpitch advised that it should be noted for the record that it is not the intent of Council, in acting on the request for rezoning by NNEO and Mr. Crowder, to impinge upon the right of Quality Produce Company and its activities in any way, inasmuch as Quality Produce Company provides a valuable service for the community. He further advised that the City can request that a communication be issued stating that the operation of Quality Produce Company has been reviewed by staff and as far as City staff can determine its operations are in conformance with zoning requirements and the City of Roanoke is not aware of any reason that any of there operations by Quality Produce Company should be cause for concern. Hearing no objection by Council Members, Mr. Bestpitch requested that City staff prepare the appropriate communication.

The Mayor declared the public hearing closed.

There being no further discussion by Council, Ordinance No. 36225-020303 was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Dowe, Harris, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler, and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Carder was absent.)

STREETS AND ALLEYS: Council at its regular meeting on Tuesday, January 21, 2003, having continued a public hearing on the request of the Northwest Neighborhood Environmental Organization that all of the alley from 6th Street to 5th Street, N. W., in the block lying between Loudon Avenue and Centre Avenue, beginning at the east side of 6th Street, between lots bearing Official Tax Nos. 2013101 and 2013115, and extending east to its intersection with 5th Street, between lots bearing Official Tax Nos. 2013114 and 2013123, extending north, and on the west extending along the east border of the lot bearing Official Tax No. 2013109 and on the east extending along the west border of lots bearing Official Tax Nos. 2013114-2013110, extending north to its intersection with Loudon Avenue, be permanently vacated, discontinued and closed, the matter was again before the body.

Mr. Bestpitch offered the following ordinance:

(#36226-020303) AN ORDINANCE permanently vacating, discontinuing and closing certain public rights-of-way in the City of Roanoke, Virginia, as more particularly described hereinafter; and dispensing with the second reading of this ordinance by title.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 67, page 108.)

Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 36226-020303. The motion was seconded by Mr. Harris.

The Mayor inquired if there were persons present who would like to be heard in connection with the matter. There being none, he declared the public hearing closed.

There being no questions/comments by Council Members, Ordinance No. 36226-020303 was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Dowe, Harris, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Carder was absent.)

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS:

ZONING-ANIMALS/INSECTS-COMMUNITY PLANNING: Norman D. Mason, President, Board of Directors, The Angels of Assisi, advised that the organization is a charity whose purpose is to provide low income pet owners with affordable veterinary services; and since its inception in August 2001, The Angels of Assisi surgical unit has performed over 9,000 spays or neuters for low income owners of pets and for local humane shelters in the Roanoke Valley. He stated that in August 2002, The Angels of Assisi opened a small full-service clinic providing outpatient medical services and surgeries to low income citizens of the Roanoke Valley, and although restricted in space and open initially for only three days a week, the clinic provided service to over 1,100 patients through January 2003.

Mr. Mason explained that The Angels of Assisi would like to expand its charitable services to the Roanoke community by acquiring a larger clinic facility; therefore, a contract was placed on property located at 415 Campbell Avenue, S. W., however, the location is zoned C-3 for which there does not exist an exemption for veterinary hospitals or clinics for consideration by the Board of Zoning Appeals. He stated that if the organization is permitted to purchase and improve the property, it can better serve the needs of Roanoke's citizens and, at the same time, enhance a portion of the "downtown" area which has been filled largely with vacant buildings and warehouses; and the location is also near the Roanoke City Police Department which would allow The Angels of Assisi to provide free service to the City's canine officers in the K-9 Corp.

Mr. Mason explained that the proposed facility will not house animals outside, and called attention to plans to significantly improve the entire appearance of the vacant building and the rear parking lot; however, the support of Council is needed to implement a change in the C-3 zoning district to allow for an exemption to be considered by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Bestpitch moved that the request be referred to the City Planning Commission for study, report and recommendation to Council, in connection with a text amendment for a special exception to be added to the C-3 zoning classification. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cutler.

Ms. Wyatt advised that downtown Roanoke is not the appropriate location for a facility of this type; whereupon, she inquired if Mr. Mason had looked at other property that is properly zoned for this purpose. Mr. Mason responded in the affirmative, and called attention to higher costs in other areas of the City; however, he advised that the property in question is suitable for their needs because it is contiguous to those communities that are served most frequently by The Angels of Assisi. In addition, he stated that with minor modifications, there is more than ample

parking, and access from the rear of the building will be enhanced with appropriate modifications. He called attention to various needs of the organization and the property in question fits those needs.

The City Manager advised that she previously informed Mr. Mason that she could not recommend approval of the request inasmuch as the City is currently in the midst of a Zoning Ordinance update and it is wise to avoid piecemeal changes to the Zoning Ordinance unless there is a specific hardship. She stated that there is no indication that there is a demand in the downtown, C-3 zoning classification, for this type of service, and a text amendment would allow consideration of this particular special exception in every location in the downtown area which is included in the C-3 zoning classification. She advised that she informed Mr. Mason that she could not support the requested text amendment and it would be necessary for him to request that either City Council or the City Planning Commission initiate a zoning ordinance text amendment.

There being no further discussion, the motion was adopted.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS:

CITY MANAGER:

CITIZEN SURVEY BRIEFINGS: The City Manager introduced Susan Wilson Walton, representing Virginia Polytechnic -Institute and State University, to present results of a citizen survey performed by Virginia Tech Center for Survey Research.

(For full text, survey results on the file in the City Clerk's Office.)

During a discussion of survey results, Mr. Dowe requested more information in regard to those areas that have experienced a decrease in favor by ten per cent or more; and Ms. Wyatt requested information on the results of the break out questions pertaining to the Roanoke Civic Center.

The City Manager advised that the full report will be provided to the Council upon receipt.

Without objection by Council, the Mayor advised that the briefing would be received and filed.

ITEMS RECOMMENDED FOR ACTION:

BUDGET-CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that capital projects of all types have been approved by Council in the Capital Improvements Program; bond funds from the 1999 bond issue needs to be transferred to capital project accounts, along with a portion of the 2002 bond issue for implementation of construction projects; and the following transfers are recommended:

\$391,355.00 from Public Improvement Bonds Series 1999 – Storm Drains, Account No. 008-052-9709-9176, to the following new accounts to be established by the Director of Finance.

\$73,355.00	Peters Creek Flood Mitigation Phase 4
114,000.00	Trout Run Culvert Repairs
204,000.00	Barnhart Street Drainage Improvements

\$9,169.00 from Public Improvement Bonds Series 1999 – Buildings, Account No. 008-052-9709-9183, to Account No. 008-530-9776, Public Works Service Center Upgrade Phase I.

\$809,080.00 from Public Improvement Bond Series 1999 – Bridges, Account No. 008-052-9709-9190, to the following accounts.

\$ 750,000.00	First Street Pedestrian Bridge, Account No. 008-052-9574
\$ 59,080.00	Walnut Avenue Bridge over Railroad, Account No. 008-530-9511

\$698,613.00 from Public Improvement Bonds Series 1999 – Streets, Account No. 008-052-9709-9191, to the following new accounts to be established by the Director of Finance.

\$ 143,859.00	Williamson Road Improvements
\$ 127,414.00	Traffic Signals
\$ 410,000.00	VDOT Highway Projects
\$ 17,340.00	Roadway Safety Improvement Project, Account No. 008-052-9606

\$3,391,630.00 from Public Improvement Bonds Series 2002 – Curb & Gutter, Account No. 008-530-9711-9195, to the following new accounts.

\$ 891,630.00	Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk #1
\$ 500,000.00	Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk #2
\$ 500,000.00	Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk #3
\$ 500,000.00	Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk #4
\$ 500,000.00	Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk #5
\$ 500,000.00	Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk #6

The City Manager recommended transfer of funds to existing project accounts and/or to new accounts to be established by the Director of Finance.

Mr. Dowe offered the following budget ordinance:

(#36227-020303) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2002-2003 Capital Projects Fund Appropriations, and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 67, page 111 .)

Mr. Dowe moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 36227-020303. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cutler and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Dowe, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler, and Mayor Smith---5.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Carder was absent.) (Vice-Mayor Harris abstained from voting.)

INDUSTRIES: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that Elizabeth Arden, Inc., a tenant in a 250,000 square foot facility at the Roanoke Centre for Industry and Technology (RCIT), and Liberty Property Limited Partnership (Liberty), the property owner, wishes to expand at its present site; expansion will require a waiver from the present Restrictive Covenants at RCIT; covenants require a 75-foot setback for both the building and the parking lot, however, the size and layout of the site expansion requires that setback be 41 feet for the parking lot and 35 feet for the building; and if an application for vacation of a City of Roanoke right-of-way at the site is approved, the setback for the building will be in compliance.

It was further advised that the Restrictive Covenants state in paragraph 6 that the above requirement may be waived by the City of Roanoke, however, requirements of paragraph 13 must be met which provide as follows: “13.

Amendments. Except as herein provided, each of the foregoing Restrictive Covenants may as to all persons and property be waived, released, rescinded, modified, altered or amended by the City at the request of and with the consent of the owners or lessees from the City of property for terms of five (5) years or more of more than fifty percent (50%), in area, of the lots or sites within the Centre which have been sold by the City for development”.

It was noted that six tenants at RCIT have signed off on the waiver, representing over 50 per cent of tenants/owners by area of the park, which meets amendment requirements of the Restrictive Covenants; Elizabeth Arden employs 538 employees in Roanoke, and expansion will enable the company to continue to grow in employment and marks a significant investment in the Roanoke Centre for Industry and Technology.

The City Manager recommended that Council approve a waiver of the setback requirements as set forth above and that the City Manager be authorized to execute a Waiver of the Provision of the Deed of Restriction for expansion by Elizabeth Arden and to take such further action and to execute any other documents deemed necessary for expansion.

Mr. Dowe offered the following resolution:

(#36228-020303) A RESOLUTION to provide for certain waivers and consents by the City of certain restrictive covenants in connection with certain real property located at the Roanoke Centre for Industry and Technology (RCIT) and owned by Liberty Property Limited Partnership (Liberty) and occupied by Elizabeth Arden, Inc., authorizing the proper City officials to execute such waivers and consents on behalf of the City in connection with those restrictive covenants; and authorizing the proper City officials to execute any other documents to conclude the proposed expansion of the facility occupied by Elizabeth Arden, Inc., at RCIT.

(For full text of Resolution, see Resolution Book No. 67, page 113.)

Mr. Dowe moved the adoption of Resolution No. 36228-020303. The motion was seconded by Ms. Wyatt and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Dowe, Harris, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler, and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Carder was absent.)

BUDGET-PUBLIC WORKS: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that in July 2002, the City advertised for a consultant to prepare a master plan for the Public Works Service Center (PWSC); the plan proposes a phased implementation of improvements at the PWSC to centralize functions and to improve efficiency of operations; and the following items, listed by division, are to be implemented as the first phase of improvements to the facility:

Transportation Division:

Salt Storage Building – new salt storage facility to include approximately half of the sheds required for storage of salt spreaders, snow plows, etc.

Landscape Maintenance Equipment Shop – modifications to existing warehouse as needed to perform maintenance and repair of equipment, which will allow activity to move from the Reserve Avenue site to the PWSC.

Fleet Maintenance Division:

Fleet Maintenance Doors – Installation of three overhead doors along the west wall of the Fleet Maintenance Shop, which will improve efficiency and productivity of the facility by allowing access to service bays from outside of the building.

Solid Waste Division:

Solid Waste Island – new concrete median strip with electrical receptacles to serve diesel engine block heaters of Solid Waste trucks. Existing median to be displaced by new Salt Storage Building.

It was further advised that funding, in the amount of \$1,000,000.00, is needed for the projects and is available from the following sources to be transferred to Public Works Service Center, Account No. 008-530-9776, which currently has a balance of \$378,662.00:

Transfer to Capital Projects Fund	Account No. 001-250-9310-9508	\$170,000.00
Undesignated Fund Balance	Account No. 008-3349	\$256,641.00
Brandon Avenue Widening	Account No. 008-052-9604	\$152,757.00
Fleet Maintenance Retained Earnings		\$41,940.00

The City Manager recommended that Council transfer the above referenced funds to the Public Works Service Center, Account No. 008-530-9776, to provide total funding of \$1,000,000.00.

Mr. Dowe offered the following budget ordinance:

(#36229-020303) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2002-2003 Capital Projects and Fleet Management Funds Appropriations, and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 67, page 115.)

Mr. Dowe moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 36229-020303. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cutler and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Dowe, Harris, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Carder was absent.)

POLICE DEPARTMENT-BUDGET-GRANTS: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) provides grant funding for programs and activities which increase apprehension, prosecution and adjudication of persons committing violent crimes against women; and the program, "Virginia Services, Training, Officers, Prosecution Violence Against Women" (VSTOP) has funded a Domestic Violence Unit within the Police Department since 1999.

It was further advised that on December 19, 2002, DCJS awarded \$32,403.00 to the City's Police Department to employ a full-time, non-sworn Domestic Violence Specialist, thereby allowing continuation of the Domestic Violence Unit in calendar year 2003; the required City in-kind match of \$23,127.00 will be met through salary paid to current Police Department personnel; and the required local cash match of \$3,136.00 will be met through State Asset Forfeiture Funds, Account No. 035-640-3302.

It was explained that the Domestic Violence Unit collects and interprets relevant domestic violence offense data which allows proactive case intervention and cultivation of cooperative working relationships with clients and service/adjudication agencies; and the program produces more equitable victim-offender criminal justice dispositions related to domestic violence offenses.

The City Manager recommended that Council accept the V-STOP grant and that the City Manager be authorized to execute the grant agreement and any related documents; appropriate State grant funds, in the amount of \$32,403.00, with a corresponding revenue estimate in accounts to be established by the Director of Finance in the Grant Fund; and transfer the local match of \$3,136.00 from State Asset Forfeiture Funds, Account No. 035-640-3302, to the same Grant Fund account.

Ms. Wyatt offered the following budget ordinance:

(#36230-020303) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2002-2003 Grant Fund Appropriations, and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 67, page 116.)

Ms. Wyatt moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 36230-020303. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Dowe, Harris, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Carder was absent.)

Mr. Dowe offered the following resolution:

(#36231-020303) A RESOLUTION accepting the Virginia Services, Training, Officers, Prosecution (VSTOP) Violence Against Women Grant offer made to the City by the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services and authorizing execution of any documentation on behalf of the City.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 67, page 118.)

Mr. Dowe moved the adoption of Resolution No. 36231-020303. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cutler and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Dowe, Harris, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Carder was absent.)

TRAFFIC-BUDGET-TRANSPORTATION SAFETY: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that Council has been briefed on several ongoing transportation projects, the goal of which is calming traffic and making the City’s transportation corridors more pedestrian friendly; areas of improvement include, but may not be limited to, Memorial Avenue, Grandin Road, Williamson Road, Jamison Avenue and Bullitt Avenue; traffic calming initiatives are preliminary in nature, therefore, a firm cost estimate has not been established for each of the projects; and, funding in the amount of \$236,870.00 has been identified as available to support further development and implementation of the initiatives.

The City Manager recommended that Council transfer \$236,870.00 from the Valley View Boulevard Interchange, Account No. 008-052-9545, to a new account to be entitled, Traffic Calming Initiatives.

Based on discussion by Council at its 9:00 a.m. work session, the City Manager advised that she would withdraw the item from the agenda until Council has an opportunity to discuss specific traffic calming projects, since there was an earlier indication by Council that it was not in support of the various staff presentations regarding traffic calming.

Mr. Bestpitch offered the following budget ordinance:

(#36232) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2002-2003 Capital Projects Fund Appropriations, and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance.

Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 36232 The motion was seconded by Mr. Cutler.

The City Manager pointed out that the ordinance, as drafted, requires five affirmative votes by the Council to pass.

Ms. Wyatt noted that the previous discussion by Council was not in opposition to the various traffic calming projects, but the need for more definitive information no how the money will be spent.

Mr. Bestpitch advised that there have been numerous briefings on the various aspects of traffic calming issues in different parts of the City. He expressed concern that Council is micro-managing, and expressed confidence in the professional staff of the City in the process of the Council briefings, and suggested that staff be permitted to proceed as requested by the City Manager. He stated that Council Members have had more than ample time to request additional information from the City Manager.

Mr. Bestpitch moved that the ordinance be amended to delete the phrase "dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance." The amendment to the motion was seconded by Mr. Cutler and adopted.

Mr. Bestpitch moved that the following ordinance be placed upon its first reading:

(#36232) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2002-2003 Capital Projects Fund Appropriations.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Cutler.

The Mayor expressed concern that transferring \$237,000.00 from the Valley View Boulevard Interchange account causes further delay for completion of Phase II of the Valley View Interchange project. He stated that funds requested by the City Manager are not designated for a specific traffic calming proposal; Council is not micro managing by requesting more definitive information on specific traffic calming plans and costs; and it is the responsibility of Council to raise questions and to vote on specific issues when they are presented by the City administration.

Mr. Dowe advised that Council Members appear to be in favor of implementing traffic calming measures in the various sections of the City; the Council has received briefings in regard to traffic calming, and inquired if the funds are intended to be used for specific traffic calming projects. He stated that further clarification by the City Manager would likely enable the item to be favorably considered by the Council.

The City Manager responded that four specific areas for traffic calming have been discussed with the Council; i.e.: Memorial Avenue, Grandin Road, Williamson Road and the Bullitt/Jamison corridor. She advised that conceptual drawings have been provided in each of the areas and staff has met with neighborhood groups to receive feedback on the various plans. She explained that the \$237,000.00 will fund detailed cost estimates and final design on the four traffic calming projects. She stated that she could not provide a precise breakdown on how the \$237,000.00 will be expended.

In view of the City Manager's explanation that the requested funds represent initial planning money and not implementation funds, Ms. Wyatt advised that she could support the request for funds. She stated that she was voting for planning money and not implementation of the studies, which she does not consider to be micro managing, but being a good steward of the taxpayers' money. She expressed concern regarding the Williamson Road area and while she favors traffic calming, it is an issue of balance; if severe traffic calming measures are enacted on arterial

roads into and out of the City, an even bigger problem will be created for the neighborhoods because motorists will begin to use circuitous routes around main arteries by going into the neighborhoods and creating traffic problems. She called attention to Grandview Avenue which is currently used as a cut through and if Williamson Road is limited to 25 miles per hour, substantial traffic will be diverted into the residential neighborhoods. She cautioned against creating traffic quagmires so great that motorists will not use certain sections of the City.

Mr. Cutler advised that the City Manager has proposed to use funds remaining in the Valley View Mall/I-581 overpass account and he was not opposed to using the funds for this purpose since it was earlier reported that the second phase of the Valley View Interchange project will not occur for another 10-15 years under the current VDOT plan.

The Mayor called attention to the paving of a section of Williamson Road which was promised last year and delayed by City staff. He stated that he was not aware that businesses and residents of the Williamson Road area have reached any consensus, a good plan was initially presented and the City agreed to provide paving which was later stalled, and the matter currently before the Council is another attempt to stall the request. He stated that in defense of the Williamson Road area and the Raleigh Court area, both of which are not satisfied with traffic calming plans as presented, he could not support the City Manager's request for funds.

Vice-Mayor Harris advised that the Mayor's remarks represent an erroneous report of the matter before the Council. He stated that funds are not recommended for appropriation so that a specific traffic calming plan can be implemented, but the City Manager is requesting that Council appropriate funds to enable City staff to place a price tag on the various elements and concepts of the four traffic calming projects so as to provide Council with the necessary information to determine whether specific traffic calming plans are to go forward to implementation.

There being no further discussion, Ordinance No. 36232, on its first reading, was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Dowe, Harris , Wyatt, Bestpitch, and Cutler-----5.

NAYS: Mayor Smith-----1.

(Council Member Carder was absent.)

SEWERS AND STORM DRAINS-WATER RESOURCES-LEGISLATION: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that, mandated by Congress under the Clean Water Act, the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Storm Water Program is a comprehensive program for addressing urban sources of storm water pollution; the program uses the State's permitting authority to require implementation of storm water management controls; under the Act, the City of Roanoke is required to submit a Registration Statement outlining specific ways that the City proposes to comply with program requirements; and the Registration Statement must be submitted to the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality by March 10, 2003.

It was further advised that City staff has completed a Registration Statement outlining minimum measures for compliance by the City which include: City-wide public education and participation, identifying and removing non-storm water flows, pre and post construction site runoff controls and pollution prevention measures for municipal operations; and compliance efforts are estimated to cost between \$190,000.00 and \$225,000.00 per year, commencing in March 2003, with the initial permit period lasting five years.

The City Manager recommended that she be authorized to execute a Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (VPDES) General Permit Registration Statement for Storm Water Discharges from Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems [VAR040] on behalf of the City, with the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality; and that she be authorized to take such further action and to execute and provide further documents as may be necessary to comply with and implement the VPDES General Permit, including necessary contracts or agreements with third parties, to complete activities outlined in the VPDES General Permit.

Mr. Dowe offered the following resolution:

(#36233-020303) A RESOLUTION authorizing the City Manager to execute, for and on behalf of the City of Roanoke, a Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (VPDES) General Permit Registration Statement for storm water discharge from small municipal separate storm sewer systems with the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, upon certain terms and conditions; and authorizing the City Manager to take such further action and to execute and provide such further documents as may be necessary to comply with or implement the provisions of that Registration Statement.

(For full text of Resolution, see Resolution Book No. 67, page 119.)

Mr. Dowe moved the adoption of Resolution No. 36233-020303. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cutler and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Dowe, Harris, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Carder was absent.)

Council Member Cutler commended the City's Environmental Administrator and other City staff on a well written document.

TRAFFIC-BUDGET-SIGNALS AND ALARMS: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that Council has been briefed on the need to make improvements to the City's traffic signal systems to reduce congestion and to improve the City's ability to effectively manage the existing public street infrastructure; and initial improvements will focus on the Orange Avenue corridor between Gainsboro Road and Gus Nicks Boulevard, which systems will support the daily demands of rush hour traffic, as well as occasional demands created by the Roanoke Civic Center and the future Stadium/Amphitheater facility.

The City Manager recommended that Council approve transfer of \$266,156.00 from Paving Program Account No. 001-530-4120-2010, and \$63,844.00 from Streets & Bridges, Capital Improvement Reserve Account No. 008-052-9575-9173, to a new account in the Capital Projects Fund to be entitled, Traffic Signal Systems.

Mr. Dowe offered the following budget ordinance:

(#36234-020303) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2002-2003 General and Capital Projects Fund Appropriations, and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 67, page 120.)

Mr. Dowe moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 36234-020303. The motion was seconded by Mr. Harris and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Dowe, Harris, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Carder was absent.)

CITY ATTORNEY:

BUDGET-PARKS AND RECREATION-SCHOOLS: The City Attorney submitted a written report advising that on May 28, 1965, the National Park Service, pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 conveyed, by deed, 7.83 acres of land to the City (Tax Parcel #2340121), which conveyance included certain terms, conditions, covenants and restrictions that required the property to be used and maintained for public park or public recreational purposes.

It was further advised that on January 22, 2002, Council adopted Resolution No. 35728-012202 authorizing the Roanoke City School Board to use approximately 8.5 acres of land on the corner of 19th Street and Andrews Road for the new Roanoke Academy of Mathematics and Science; the measure contained a provision that the School Board receive the required approval from the United States Department of the Interior for a land exchange; on November 21, 2002, such approval was obtained and the approval, release and transfer of terms, conditions, covenants and restrictions from the above described property has been received; as a result of this action, the City proposes to remove the terms, conditions, covenants and restrictions enumerated in the 1965 conveyance from a 3.217 ± acre tract of land, lying within the boundary of Kennedy Park, to enable the School Board to use the property for educational purposes, and to transfer the same terms, conditions, covenants and restrictions to a 1.039± acre tract of land located at Riverland Road Addition (Roanoke River Greenway properties).

The City Attorney transmitted an ordinance authorizing the City Manager to sign a Release and Transfer of Terms, Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions transferring the terms, conditions, covenants and restrictions from the 3.217± acre tract of land lying within the boundary of Kennedy Park, to enable the School Board to use the property for educational purpose, namely the Roanoke Academy of

Mathematics and Science, and transferring the same terms, conditions, covenants and restrictions to a 1.039± acre tract of land located at Riverland Road Addition and Primrose Avenue.

Mr. Dowe offered the following ordinance:

(#36235-020303) AN ORDINANCE authorizing the City Manager to execute a Release and Transfer of Terms, Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions transferring the terms, conditions, covenants and restrictions from the 3.217± acre tract lying within the boundary of Kennedy Park, to enable the Roanoke City School Board to use the property for educational purposes, namely Roanoke Academy of Mathematics and Science; and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 67, page 122.)

Mr. Dowe moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 36235-020303. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cutler and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Dowe, Harris, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Carder was absent.)

CITY CLERK:

SCHOOLS: The City Clerk submitted a written report advising that pursuant to Chapter 9, Education, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended, establishing a procedure for the election of School Trustees, the three-year terms of office of F. B. Webster Day, Marsha W. Ellison and Gloria P. Manns as Trustees of the Roanoke City School Board will expire on June 30, 2003; and Ms. Ellison is ineligible to serve another term inasmuch as she has served three consecutive three year terms of office.

It was further advised that pursuant to Section 9-16 of the Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended, on or before February 15 of each year, Council shall announce its intention to elect Trustees of the Roanoke City School Board for terms commencing July 1 through (1) public announcement of such intention at two consecutive regular sessions of the Council and (2) advertisement of such intention in a newspaper of general circulation in the City twice a week for two consecutive weeks.

It was pointed out that Section 9-17 of the City Code provides that applications must be filed in the City Clerk's Office by March 10 of each year; application forms will be available in the City Clerk's Office and may be obtained between the hours of 8:00 a.m., and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday; and information describing the duties and responsibilities of School Trustees will also be available.

There being no questions and without objection by Council, the Mayor advised that the report of the City Clerk would be received and filed.

DIRECTOR OF FINANCE:

DIRECTOR OF FINANCE-AUDITS/FINANCIAL REPORTS: The Director of Finance submitted the Financial Report for the City of Roanoke for the month of December 2002.

There being no questions and without objection by Council, the Mayor advised that the Financial Report for December 2002 would be received and filed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES: NONE.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: NONE.

INTRODUCTION AND CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS:

Y.M.C.A.-LEASES-SCHOOLS: Ordinance No. 36223, authorizing and directing the proper City officials to enter into a lease extension between the City, the School Board of the City of Roanoke and the Young Men's Christian Association of Roanoke, Virginia, for use of the Jefferson High School gymnasium, upon certain terms and conditions, to provide for a six month extension commencing on January 19, 2003 and ending on July 18, 2003, having previously been before the Council for its first reading on Tuesday, January 21, 2003, read and adopted on its first reading and laid over, was again before the body, Mr. Harris offering the following for its second reading and final adoption:

(#36223-020303) AN ORDINANCE authorizing and directing the proper City officials to enter into a lease extension between the City, the School Board of the City of Roanoke and the Young Men's Christian Association of Roanoke, Virginia, for use of the Jefferson High School gymnasium, upon certain terms and conditions.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 67, page 105)

Mr. Harris moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 36223-020303. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dowe and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Dowe, Harris, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Carder was absent.)

BUDGET-RISK MANAGEMENT FUND: The Director of Finance submitted a written report advising that the City is self-insured for certain types of claims and insurance deductibles; funds are included in the Risk Management budget to pay small claims and settlements; additional funds totaling \$100,000.00 are needed to pay claims for the remainder of the fiscal year; and funds are available in Risk Management Fund Retained Earnings.

The Director of Finance recommended that Council adopt a budget ordinance appropriating \$100,000.00 from Risk Management Fund Retained Earnings to be used for settlement of claims.

Mr. Harris offered the following budget ordinance:

(#36236-020303) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2002-2003 Risk Management Fund Appropriations, and dispensing with the second reading by title of this ordinance.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 67, page 123.)

Mr. Harris moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 36236-020303. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dowe and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Dowe, Harris, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Carder was absent.)

MOTIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

INQUIRIES AND/OR COMMENTS BY THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF COUNCIL:

TREES: Council Member Cutler called attention to a Tree Virginia Workshop to be held on March 5, 2003, at Virginia Western Community College.

HEARING OF CITIZENS UPON PUBLIC MATTERS: The Mayor advised that Council sets this time as a priority for citizens to be heard. Matters requiring referral to the City Manager will be referred immediately for response, recommendation or report to Council.

COMPLAINTS-TAXES-WATER RESOURCES: Ms. Josephine Hudson, 1111 Loudon Avenue, N. W. , advised that on January 19, 2002, she received a notice of increase in her real estate assessment and another increase was received on January 1, 2003. She expressed concern that many persons are losing their homes, the job market is troubling, water rates in the City of Roanoke have been increased by 35 per cent, and actions by previous City Councils to shift funds from the Water Fund to the General Fund.

CITY MANAGER COMMENTS:

CITY GOVERNMENT: The City Manager advised of two new programs to be initiated by the City; i.e.: a "citizen university" which will afford citizens the opportunity to receive indepth exposure to various aspects of City government; and the City's version of a "welcome wagon", which is designed to provide new residents to the City of Roanoke with information that will acclimate them to life in the Roanoke Valley.

At 4:20 p.m., the Mayor declared the meeting in recess for two closed sessions.

At 4:35 p.m. the meeting reconvened in the Council Chamber with Mayor Smith presiding, and all Members of the Council in attendance, with the exception of Council Member Carder.

COUNCIL: With respect to the Closed Meeting just concluded Mr. Bestpitch moved that each Member of City Council certify to the best of his or her knowledge that: (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in any motion by which any Closed Meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered by City Council. The motion was seconded by Mr. Harris and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Dowe, Harris, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Cutler and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----0.

(Council Member Carder was absent.)

At 4:40 p.m., the Mayor declared the meeting in recess to be immediately reconvened in Room 159 for a continuation of the 9:00 a.m. Council work session.

At 4:45 p.m., the meeting reconvened in Room 159, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., for a continuation of the 9:00 a.m., work session, with Mayor Smith presiding, and all Members of the Council in attendance, with the exception of Council Member Carder.

WILDLIFE TASK FORCE:

The Assistant City Manager for Community Development reviewed a communication from the City Manager under date of January 21, 2003, in connection with recommendations of the Wildlife Task Force:

1. Task Force Recommendation - Modify the current City Code, Sec. 21-040.2, to allow for the use of electric fences on residentially zoned properties as a means of discouraging deer from entering a yard.

Staff Response: Modifying the current City Code to allow for the use of electric fences will create a public safety threat. When incorporated into residential settings, electric fences pose a significant threat to children and/or to pets that may inadvertently come into contact with such fencing. Although signs may be posted to alert individuals about the presence of electric fences on a particular property, children, depending on their age, may not be able to read and/or comprehend the meaning of such warnings. Therefore, City staff cannot support this recommendation.

2. Taskforce Recommendation - Enact an ordinance making it unlawful to intentionally feed wild animals, such as deer.

Staff Response - It would be an unproductive use of staff time and resources to draft an ordinance that would be nearly impossible to enforce. Furthermore, elderly or home-bound citizens who place corn or similar materials in their yards for small animals should not be labeled as “criminals” for that action. Therefore, City staff cannot support this recommendation.

3. Taskforce Recommendation - Establish an education program to inform citizens of deer issues within the City and possible solutions for managing them.

Staff Response - Public education is an effective means of raising citizen awareness about the deer issues currently facing the City. Brochures can be created and distributed that inform citizens on actions they can take to assist in managing deer issues. Additionally, public meeting(s) can be held, using guest speakers, to further educate the community. City staff supports this recommendation and estimates that approximately \$1,500.00 would be expended for printing and distribution of educational materials.

4. Taskforce Recommendation - The City to allocate sufficient staff and resources to handle the deer and wildlife management programs.

Staff Response - Representatives from the following departments are currently involved with and working on issues identified by the Wildlife Taskforce: Police, Parks and Recreation, Planning, Building and Development, Housing and Neighborhood Services, Environmental and Emergency Management and the City Attorney. A further explanation of allocating resources (money) will be discussed in item #6.

5. Taskforce Recommendation - The Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries (DGIF) should be contacted to provide the City assistance with its deer issues.

Staff Response - The DGIF previously has been contacted regarding the deer issue in Roanoke and several representatives have attended Wildlife Taskforce meetings to provide their knowledge and guidance to the group. Staff personnel have contacted Jay Jeffreys, Wildlife Biologist, DGIF, who has pledged his continued support to assist the City with management of its deer issues. While the DGIF is able to

provide the services of its personnel to aid the City with deer issues, due to the budget situation on personnel issues, it is not in a position to provide monetary assistance to the City at this time. However, the DGIF has indicated to staff that the State's revised deer management plan will be available in 2004, which could offer additional guidance for managing the City's deer issues.

6. Taskforce Recommendation - Culling the deer herd in a safe, efficient and humane manner. Two options for culling the deer herd were provided and include:

A. Obtain a depopulation permit (DPOP) and institute an Urban Archery Program - Apply to the DGIF for a DPOP permit and participate in the Urban Archery Program as a means of deer control.

B. Obtain an 'Official Deer Kill Permit' - Apply to the DGIF to be permitted to institute a sharpshooting program in the City as a means of deer control.

Staff Response - Application for inclusion in the Urban Archery Program should be made by May 1, 2003. The Wildlife Taskforce anticipated that the archery program would be staffed primarily by volunteer archery groups under the auspices of the Police Department.

To pursue obtaining a DPOP or 'Official Deer Kill Permit' through the DGIF, Sec. 21-80 of the City Code would have to be modified to permit the discharging of firearms, under special circumstances, within the limits of the City. Furthermore, the costs associated with instituting and managing the program are substantial. Contracting with a deer management firm could cost approximately \$3,000.00 for initial consultation and site assessments of proposed depopulation areas within the City. The actual removal effort is estimated at \$150.00 - \$200.00 per deer, depending on concentration.

The City Manager recommended that the City contract with a private company, or site consultant, White Buffalo, Inc., and submit a recommendation to Council on proposed actions to be taken and costs to be incurred.

The City Manager's recommendation was approved by consensus of the Council.

ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE:

The Director of Planning and Code Development advised that a Zoning Ordinance update is a major implementation activity and follows up with adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, sets policy regarding land use decisions, helps to implement some of the missions of the Comprehensive Plan primarily dealing with the use of land; and the City's Zoning Ordinance was last updated in 1987. He stated that the process is divided into three phases; i.e.: Phase I - Reconnaissance - July-November, 2002; Phase II - Ordinance Draft and Public Comment - January - June 2003; and Phase III - Hearings and Adoption - July - September, 2003. He further advised that work to date on the Zoning Ordinance update involves hiring a consultant, establishment of eight focus groups, public meetings, steering committee meetings, a diagnosis report and a structural code outline. He stated that City staff is currently in Phase II of the process which includes the drafting process, internal staff review and steering committee review; under review is districts in which listed uses are allowed and permitted by right or by special exception, zoning district base regulations for each zoning district, permitted uses and dimensional regulations and supplemental regulations for each district. He indicated that the next steps include steering committee review and discussion on special purpose/overlay district, supplemental regulations for particular uses, landscaping, parking, signs, development standards, administration, procedures and development of a public review document; the zoning map will be reviewed based on establishment of districts and regulations in the draft ordinance and City-wide workshops in April - June, consideration of public feedback by the steering committee and redrafting as necessary by the consultant. He stated that Phase II, which excludes the hearings and adoption portion of the process, involves City Planning Commission and City Council public hearings in July - August 2003, with adoption of the Zoning Ordinance in September 2003.

At 5:00 p.m., the Mayor declared the meeting in recess until Tuesday, February 4, 2003, at 8:30 a.m., for the Roanoke City Council/Roanoke City School Board Retreat to be held at the Vinton War Memorial, 814 Washington Avenue, Vinton, Virginia.

The City Council meeting reconvened on Tuesday, February 4, 2003, at 8:30 a.m., at the Vinton War Memorial, 814 Washington Avenue, Vinton, Virginia, for a City Council/Roanoke City School Board Retreat.

CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: William D. Bestpitch, M. Rupert Cutler Alfred T. Dowe, Jr., (arrived late), Linda F. Wyatt and Mayor Ralph K. Smith-----5.

CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT: Vice-Mayor C. Nelson Harris and Council Member William H. Carder-----2.

SCHOOL TRUSTEES PRESENT: F. B. Webster Day, Marsha W. Ellison, Melinda J. Payne, Ruth C. Willson, William H. Lindsey, Robert T. Sparrow and Chairperson Gloria P. Manns-----7.

SCHOOL TRUSTEES ABSENT: None-----0.

STAFF PRESENT: Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; Jesse A. Hall, Director of Finance; Mary F. Parker, City Clerk; E. Wayne Harris, Superintendent of Schools; and Cindy Lee, Clerk to the Roanoke City School Board.

The facilitator for the meeting was Lyle Sumek, Lyle Sumek Associates.

COUNCIL-SCHOOLS: Mr. Sumek reviewed the agenda for the day which would include a year-in review; 2002 performance report, including City/School achievements and the working relationship between the City and the Schools; partnership framework, including roles and responsibilities of the School Board and the Mayor/City Council; looking to the future (2003 and beyond); major challenges facing the City and the Schools and the City/Schools jointly; key issues for the City and the Schools and the City/Schools jointly; work agenda for 2003, including target for action, discussion with regard to expectation and action outline, and specific game plan; and actions for partners by the two bodies.

Based on recent interviews with Council and the School Board, Mr. Sumek advised that the 2003 agenda for both Council and the School Board is:

Funding: Short term, long term, needs, mandates, requirements versus revenues

Lobbying agenda: (December, then ongoing briefing) joint lobbyist

Joint marketing program

Transportation Services

Teacher salaries: keeping competitive

Teacher attraction and retention

School staff to reflect students: strategy

Stadium

Audits: Action Plan, oversight

Services: Youth At Risk - task force

School Board: Appointments

High School Project: Commitment, Debt service

Middle School - After School Program

New grants - Expand the program

Administration/teachers: succession plan and replacement

Health care costs: cost containment strategy

Sales tax (one-half-one cent) for education

“No Child Left Behind” program funding (Federal program)

“English for Students” Program: Funding

School Accreditation: Standards of Learning

School Nurses Program: Direction/funding

Workforce Development: City/School strategy (link to economic development)

Fleet facility: location, design, funding

Technology in Schools: upgrade

Guidance Program: direction, funding

Summer School salaries

Community Learning Center: funding

The Members of Council and School Trustees worked in two groups to brainstorm the following questions: What was achieved during the past year? What worked and what did not work?

From the standpoint of Council Members, the following items were identified:

Three/four year old pre school program

Roanoke Academy for Mathematics and Science groundbreaking. Additional funding by the City for community facility to be a part of this project

Plans for a new bus garage

Plans for new stadium/amphitheater

Continued meetings in schools/use of some facilities for community meetings, neighborhood planning, etc.

HOST program – City employees who are volunteers

Student Government Day and a number of other mock Council sessions with third/fourth graders who visit the Mayor's Office

Interns from CITY School who worked with various City departments

Greenways that are used by students for track team/field science projects

Certain fire stations have adopted schools to visit on a regular basis

City Attorney's Office participation in the "Barrister Book Buddies" program in the schools

Joint use agreement between Parks and Recreation and the School division

From the School Board's perspective, the following items were identified:

**Roanoke Academy of Mathematics and Science
groundbreaking**

Stadium progress

New transportation conceptual plan

Financial reporting awards for record keeping

Progress on the Standards of Learning

Drop out rate

Dedicated marketing positions

Preschool program

Audit presentation (Letter of Engagement)

Safe and orderly schools

Two time winner of the McGothlian award

REA (Roanoke Education Association) grants (reading)

NCLB (No Child Left Behind) Readiness

Maintained time line for high school upgrades

New Board Member appointments

Roanoke Valley School Boards Consortium

HOSTS/Community Partners (City of Roanoke mentors)

The School Board identified the following which have worked well:

Good relationship with Superintendent

City Manager/Superintendent of Schools have a good working relationship

“Buddy system” is working well, but needs improvement

Legislative package

At risk children

Audit Progress is working well

Funding formula

Recognition of additional funding (The School Board knows the amount of funds to be received in advance and is sometimes allocated more than the estimated amount).

The following items were identified by the School Board as needing improvement:

Ongoing two-way communication (buddy system)

Better coordination of City/School programs

Reassessment of the joint meeting format (Council/School Board)

At 9:40 a.m., Council Member Dowe entered the meeting.

From the Council’s perspective, the following were identified as working well:

“Buddy system” is better for some than for others

Improved acceptance of auditing process

Joint reports for legislative agenda both at School Board/City level, as well as the regional level (School Board Consortium, Regional Leadership Summit, Virginia First Cities Coalition, Virginia Municipal League)

There is a less confrontational relationship between Council and the School Board

Unresolved concern over responses to audit findings

Debt service funding - the City is continuing to add to the money that is being set aside to build the new high schools - the funding formula is working well

Facility charges (City using school facilities and Schools using City facilities)

Mr. Sumek reviewed the following items that were identified by the two bodies as their agenda for 2002:

Budget and Financial Strategy

Use of Facilities - (School/City; City/School)

Youth Recreation Programs and Services

School Access to Technology

School Involvement/Participation in Economic Development

School Facilities and Renovation

Teachers Salaries

Public Information Strategy

Audit

Victory Stadium

Mr. Sumek advised that the School Board's agenda for 2002 included the following:

Foster Better Communications by:

**Following Protocol - Mayor/School Board Chairman
Communicate with each other**

**Reassess joint meeting format
Will pair up with Council to improve/enhance
communication (buddy system)**

Mr. Sumek advised that at the 2002 retreat, the School Board indicated that it needs the following from Council in order to be successful:

**Adequate funding
Information
Joint effort to market Roanoke City Public Schools**

Reinstitute presentations to Council:

**Once per month by School Administration and City
Management presentations to School Board.**

Mr. Sumek advised that in 2002, issues identified for joint problem solving included:

**Athletic facilities (joint use of facilities)
Marketing of schools, communities
Budget
Communication**

He stated that also at the 2002 retreat, the following collective actions were agreed to by Council and the School Board:

**Establish procedures for joint problem solving using two
Board and two Council Members to address issues**

**By the end of January 2002, each Board Member will make
contact with their Council "buddy" at least twice.**

Mr. Sumek advised that at the 2002 retreat, the Mayor and Members of Council identified the following actions that the Council is willing to take:

Initiate better communications with the School Board

Communicate to citizens the negative impact of “tax cuts” on the City’s ability to provide services

Pledge to maintain funding level to schools (recommend prioritizing teacher salaries over facilities)

He noted that Council identified the need for the following from the School Board in order to be successful:

**Communication
Partnership
Long-term strategic plan**

He stated that in 2002, Council identified the following issues for joint problem solving:

**Local funding
Schools as community centers
Marketing
Coordination of services for “at risk kids”
Look for “leveraging opportunities”**

Mr. Sumek reviewed the roles and responsibilities of the School Board, as follows:

**Determine policy: School system
Establish goals/direction: vision of the school system
Be an advocate: schools/quality education
Work with Council:
 To share information
 To solve problems
 To address issues
Monitor/manage “school” resources
Listen to the community**

Educate the community on education - School issues and opportunities
Serve as a Board of Directors - education system

Mr. Sumek reviewed the roles and responsibilities of Council:

Establish vision and goals
Determine policy
Develop financial policies, manage financial resources
Establish guidelines and hold the School Board accountable
Work with School Board:
 To share information
 To solve problems
 To address issues
Be an advocate: City/Quality Education
Serve as a City corporate Board of Directors

Mr. Sumek reviewed, from the 2002 retreat, the following common themes among Council Members and School Trustees to provide the City of Roanoke with the “best” education:

Schools fully accredited, passing the Standards of Learning

Well qualified, top quality teachers

Meeting the educational needs of all children

Technology proficiency

Graduates prepared for life, ready for lifelong learning

Excellent facilities and equipment to support educational programs

Positive parental involvement

Schools integrated into the community infrastructure

Students achieving their potential

Recognition for educational excellence

Mr. Sumek reviewed Roanoke's Vision 2012, Principals to Guide the Future:

Recognized as the Capital of western Virginia: economic, government service, culture

Strong neighborhoods: quality City infrastructure, livable homes

Recognized for educational excellence: First rate schools, preschools to universities

City connectivity with universities and colleges

River front developed as an exciting, mixed-use focal point: to live, to work, to play

Protection of our natural beauty and resources

Reuse and redevelopment of and for better uses

Businesses and individuals investing in Roanoke, in downtown

Entertainment destination point: major events, sports and festivals

Young adults choose to live here: reputation as an exciting place to live

Ease in travel to and from Roanoke: air, rail, highway

Quality water supply: adequate, affordable costs meeting community needs

Strong community pride in Roanoke

Financially sustainable City government with cost-effective service delivery

Mr. Sumek reviewed Roanoke 2008 goals:

**Healthy Local Economy
Strong Neighborhoods
Vibrant Greater Downtown
Quality Services: Responsive, Cost Effective**

Mr. Sumek requested that the Council and the School Board meet in groups to brainstorm the following question: What are some of the issues facing the City/Schools over the next one to two years?

From the perspective of Council, the following items were reported in regard to challenges facing the City:

Career and technical education

Funds in order to maintain services

Fall out from State funding cuts

Standards of Learning

Storm Water Management

Decreases in the budget of the Constitutional Officers who have turned to the City to make up for State budget cuts, and the City ends up picking up the slack

How to pay for, build and maintain newly built infrastructure

Effective economic development program

A way to restructure the City's tax system

Work force training

Better linkage with Virginia Western Community College

Maintaining the existing high quality of life in the Roanoke Valley to attract new employers

Preparing the work force through the Higher Education Center, Virginia Western Community College, Workforce Program and the "One Stop Program"

Communicate opportunities for jobs for young people with vocational education

More communication is needed between mechanics, artisans, craftsmen

From the perspective of the School Board, the following items were reported with regard to challenges facing the schools:

Funding programs when grant monies are exhausted

Teacher salaries reaching national/average range once again

Pre-school programs to meet need

High school extended day

High school upgrades

Summer school teacher salaries

2004 diploma requirements

Dedicated tax for education

Full accreditation for all schools

Declining enrollment

Health insurance costs (package for employees)

Health services to students

School nurses

Providing services for special education students

Acting on audit funding due to financial constraints

Continuing to address audit findings

School Board appointments

Recruiting and maintaining quality staff at all levels

NCLB (No Child Left Behind) requirements

At 12:00 noon, the meeting was declared in recess for lunch.

At 1:00 p.m., the meeting reconvened at the Vinton War Memorial with all Members of the Council and the School Board present, with the exception of Council Member Carder and School Trustee Payne.

School Trustee Melinda Payne left the meeting.

Mr. Sumek divided participants into four groups to address issues that are common to both Council and to the School Board; i.e: stadium, joint marketing and branding program, partnering with business for workforce development, health care for students, facility use policy, fleet facility, and lobbying. Each group was instructed to develop an action plan for the issue assigned to their group.

The four groups reported as follows:

STADIUM:

Reaching a decision on track facility for the schools

Ensure that athletic directors continue to be involved as stakeholders with design/construction process

Keep the School Board informed of the progress (City construction put to bid in April 2003)

Address process of schedule: concessions, fees, operating issues

LOBBYING:

Ramp up City/School participation in the Virginia First Cities Coalition and appoint a City School representative to the subcommittee for education.

(Superintendent Harris has appointed Dick Kelley, Assistant Superintendent for Operations).

(In a discussion of the matter, Superintendent Harris advised that Mr. Kelly has served as the lobbyist for the school division since 1981 and has been successful in building a sound relationship with legislators which has proven to be invaluable to the school system and he prefers to maintain the relationship.)

Engage a single lobbyist to represent City/Schools interest on increased funding for education

Continued lobbying for Schools by Dick Kelley, Assistant Superintendent.

Continued monitoring by Virginia School Board Association and Virginia Municipal League.

Use School Board members and Mayor/Council Members, citizens as relationship-building lobbyists.

HIGH SCHOOL UPGRADES:

Recap where we have been and where we are now

Upgrade estimated cost (Patrick Henry High School - \$38 million and William Fleming High School - \$40 million)

Ensure that all options have been considered

May 2004 projected start for Patrick Henry

Determine how we pay for facilities (Patrick Henry and William Fleming High Schools)

(Superintendent Harris advised that the total budget for the projects is \$78 million (\$38 million for Patrick Henry and \$40 million for William Fleming); the Schools and the City have agreed to share equally in debt service requirements for the projects; the Schools have accumulated \$950,000.00 of the \$1.6 million debt reserve required for the Patrick Henry project; the remaining \$650,000.00 of the Schools' required debt reserve for the Patrick Henry project will be accumulated during fiscal year 2003-04 (\$350,000.00) and fiscal year 2004-05 (\$300,000.00); the Schools' debt service reserve required for the William Fleming project is \$1.8 million; the Schools' debt service requirements for the William Fleming project will be accumulated during the three fiscal years from fiscal year 2005-06 to fiscal year 2007-08 (\$600,000.00 per year).

HEALTH CARE FOR CHILDREN:

Identify efficiencies and bring together health providers

Examine current efficiencies for Roanoke City Health Department and School Nurses (define roles and responsibilities)

Better educate parents (responsibilities, programs and resources)

Evaluate City/School policy – occupational health/health science

FACILITY USE POLICY:

City using school facilities and Schools using City facilities

Reciprocity policy - need for recognition of mutual benefits of cooperation (attitude - try to help one another)

Pay direct costs, but eliminate fees on both sides (a “wash”) for the purpose of enhanced good will. (The City Manager suggested the appointment of a subcommittee composed of Council Members, School Board members and staff to address the matter; and Ms. Wyatt suggested that the Roanoke Civic Center Commission be represented on the subcommittee.)

PARTNER WITH BUSINESS FOR WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT:

Why would the City and Schools want to partner with business?

**Leverage support from the private sector
Meet work force training needs of Roanoke
Area employees (leverage of curriculum)**

Cooperative education/jobs upon graduation

Identify methods to expose young students to career opportunities

Actions include:

Communicate purpose of business partnership (Business Round Table)

Economic Development Breakfast with CEO's/add School Board representative

Political support from business for education funding

Assess effectiveness of business partnership versus making appropriate mid-course corrections

**Regional Economic Development Partnership Study (K-12)
include Schools and Council**

Items listed for citizen involvement and participation in City and School system policies and decisions are:

Include school representative in “City University”

Business involvement training sessions

Increase parentental involvement in school/teacher meetings (fresh approach through free food, pot luck, provision of child care, bus transportation/buses to tour neighborhoods)

Communicate the importance of citizen involvement

Address problems, of intimidation (how to make parents feel welcome in the schools)

JOINT MARKETING/BRANDING:

Identify strengths/deficits

Repackage deficits as assets

Aggressively market Roanoke to realtors through a proactive plan

Aggressively market Roanoke to the business community

Coalition with the Chamber of Commerce

Informal meetings with business, through focus groups with a team of Council Members and School Board members

**Involve schools in City's branding process
(It was the consensus of the two bodies that this is a topic
that needs a subcommittee composed of Council and
School Board representatives.)**

REDUCED FUNDING STREAM FROM STATE:

**Lobby to have State pay its fair share for JLARC-School
construction**

**Local - identify revenue sources for high schools for debt
service**

HEALTH CARE FOR EMPLOYEES:

**Create a City/School committee to explore combined
health care programs to capitalize on cost containment
compatibility (Employees, administration/Council/School
Board.)**

**Explore creation of a regional consortium to pool
employee base and containment costs.**

**Mr. Sumek called attention to comments with regard to topics to be addressed
at future Council/School Board quarterly meetings, and noted that the above listed
items are appropriate topics for discussion by Council and the School Board.
However, he encouraged the two bodies to engage in dialogue rather than
presentations.**

**A statement was made by a School Trustee that the School Board often feels
as though it is on trial when it meets with Council in the quarterly meeting sessions;
whereupon, the City Manager advised that rather than meeting with Council at
5:00 p.m., when Council is short on time and preparing for its 7:00 p.m. session,
Council recently initiated a procedure to meet on the first Monday of each month at
9:00 a.m., for briefings, meetings with other groups, interviews, discussion of
agenda items on the 2:00 p.m. docket; etc.; therefore, meetings with the School
Board could be scheduled at 9:00 a.m. work session in lieu of the 5:00 p.m dinner
meeting getting. It was noted by a Member of Council that many times, the issue is
whether the meeting is taking place on the Council's "turf" or on the School Board's
"turf"; whereupon, it was suggested that two meetings be held at the 9:00 a.m.,**

Council work session and that two meetings be held at a location to be determined by the School Board. Seating was also discussed inasmuch as it appears that during joint meetings, Council Members sit together as a group and School Board Members sit together as a group. It was the consensus that for future work sessions, Council Members and School Board Trustees will sit with their “buddies”, and City/School staff will sit with their counter parts. It was also noted that timing of receipt of the printed agenda is problematic for the School Superintendent; whereupon, it was the consensus that the joint agenda will be distributed one week prior to the joint meeting. It was suggested that proposed agenda items will be discussed by Council at its work session on the first Monday of the month preceding the joint meeting.

Mr. Sumek suggested that quarterly meetings include dialogue with regard to the progress of the two subcommittees which are to be appointed to address branding and a facilities use policy, and that progress reports will become a routine part of the agenda.

There being no further business, the City Council meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

A P P R O V E D

ATTEST:

Mary F. Parker
City Clerk

Ralph K. Smith
Mayor
